

V. REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Mayville et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,634,252). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Mayville teaches a support for a motion transmitting remote control assembly that includes a support body and a retainer. The support body defines an axial opening disposed internally for supporting a control assembly and a slot groove disposed externally for receiving the edges of a slot in a bracket. The retainer is supported on the body and includes an annular ring supporting a pair of tabs for engaging a pair of recesses in the edges of the slot to retain the support body in the slot. The annular ring is endless to extend completely about the support body.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a one-touch cap for fixing a control cable end to a plate-like bracket having a first outer surface and a second outer surface disposed opposite and extending parallel to the first outer surface and a U-shaped slot inside of which is provided with a stepped latching part in a detachable manner. Claim 1 recites that the one-touch cap includes a tubular body having a cable fixing part for fixing a cable end and an internal cavity extending along a longitudinal axis, a first flange, a second flange and an elastic piece. Claim 1 recites that the first flange has a first flange inner surface and the second flange has a second flange inner surface disposed apart from and facing the first flange inner surface. Claim 1 recites that the first flange inner surface is disposed in a first plane and the second flange inner surface is disposed in a second plane spaced apart from the first plane in a parallel manner to define an interval between the first and second planes with respective ones of the first and second flange inner surfaces engaged in facial contact with respective ones of the first and second outer surfaces of the bracket. Claim 1 further recites that the elastic piece is provided between the first and second flanges and disposed in its entirety within the interval. Claim 1 also recites that the elastic piece has a base portion connected to a bottom of the tubular body below the longitudinal axis, an outer surface provided with an engaging claw disposed above the longitudinal

axis to be engaged with the stepped latching part of the bracket and a free end extending upward above the longitudinal axis with the engaging claw positioned between the base portion and the free end.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each element of claim 1 as we propose to amend it. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach a first flange with a first flange inner surface disposed in a first plane and a second flange with a second flange inner surface disposed in a second plane spaced apart from the first plane in a parallel manner to define an interval between the first and second planes with respective ones of the first and second flange inner surfaces engaged in facial contact with respective ones of the first and second outer surfaces of the bracket. Further, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach an elastic piece provided between the first and second flanges and disposed in its entirety within the interval defined by the first and second planes. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Burger (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,947). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Burger teaches a spring for attaching a cable end fitting to a bracket. A support wall has a predetermined thickness between opposite surfaces and an inwardly extending periphery defining a U-shaped slot. A fitting defining an annular groove and the periphery of the U-shaped slot is disposed in the groove whereby the support wall supports the fitting. First and second projections are disposed on the support wall. A U-shaped retainer clip has legs extending from a base and terminating in distal ends with the base and the legs disposed in the groove. The distal ends extend out of the groove and engage the projections for retaining the fitting in the U-shaped slot.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each element of claim 1 as discussed above. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly-added claims 5-8 also include features not shown in the applied art. Mayville teaches a support for a motion transmitting remote control assembly that includes a support body 12 and a retainer 22, which are separately manufactured. Burger teaches an assembly to attach a cable end to a bracket that includes a fitting 21 and a retainer clip 24, which are also separately manufactured. It is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach the features of claim 5.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 13, 2005

By: 

David T. Nikaido
Reg. No. 22,663

Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER, P.L.L.C
1233 20th Street, N.W., Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 955-3750
Facsimile: (202) 955-3751
CUSTOMER 23353

Enclosure(s): Request for Continued Examination
Amendment Transmittal

DC193396.DOC